

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-23 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al. (US 5,832,000, “Lin” hereinafter) in view of Lundby (US 6,856,604).

5

**Response:**

Claim 1 recites the features of:

“**successively** transmitting a first predetermined number of more than one identical copies of a data block with a first transmitter of the first peer; receiving at least two of the first predetermined number of identical copies of the data block with a second receiver of the second peer; and combining more than one corrupted received data blocks to form a complete copy of the data block at the second peer.”

15        The Examiner has contended that Lin teaches all claimed features except for transmitting and receiving identical copies of data, and combining corrupted data to form a complete copy of the data. Instead, the Examiner has alleged that Lundby teaches these features in column 2, lines 1-5.

20        A key feature of the claimed invention is **successively** transmitting identical copies of a data block. Lundby teaches in column 1, line 67 to column 2, line 2, “*Hence, it could be said that the base station is wasting channel resources every time the base station makes multiple transmissions with the same data content.*” Here, Lundby refers to a system transmitting the same data content (i.e. the same message) to multiple users without using a multiple channels.

25        Lundby does not disclose sending the data or message multiple times successively. Therefore, the combination of Lin and Lundby does not teach the feature of “**successively** transmitting a first predetermined number of more than one identical copies of a data block with a first transmitter of the first peer” that

is recited in claim 1. Claim 1 clearly states that the first transmitter successively transmits a data block multiple times. This feature is not disclosed by Lin or Lundby.

5           The Examiner goes on to say on page 3 of the Office action dated 05/29/2009:

“*Further, Lundby discloses combine corrupted data to attain the original information, column 5, lines 35-36.*

10           *Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Lundby’s combining corrupted data to form a complete copy of the data because this would have enabled the base station to transmit information to a remote station using a format where data was repeated in a packet, column 5, lines 33-35.”*

15           However, Lundby merely discloses that “data symbols are repeated in a packet”, rather than a packet is transmitted multiple times successfully. Thus, Lundby does not teach that a packet is repeatedly transmitted, but only that the data symbols, such as 1’s and 0’s are duplicated in a packet to increase the auto-correction rate in the receiver.

20           For the above reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Lin and Lundby does not teach all of the features of claim 1, and claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art.

25           Claims 2-12 and 27 are dependent claims of claim 1. If claim 1 is allowable over Lin and Lundby as argued above, claims 2-12 and 27 shall also be allowable.

30           Claim 13 recites the feature of “a first processor electrically connected to the first transmitter for controlling the first transmitter to successively transmit a first

predetermined number of more than one identical copies of a data block via the first antenna". For the same reasons explained above with respect to claim 1, claim 13 is also patentable over the combination of Lin and Lundby.

5        Claims 14-18 are dependent claims of claim 13. If claim 13 is allowable over Lin and Lundby as argued above, claims 14-18 shall also be allowable.

10        Claim 19 recites "a second processor electrically connected to the second receiver for combining more than one data blocks received successively to form a complete copy of the data block". For the same reasons explained above with respect to claim 1, claim 13 is also patentable over the combination of Lin and Lundby.

15        Claims 20-23, 25, and 26 are dependent claims of claim 19. If claim 19 is allowable over Lin and Lundby as argued above, claims 20-23, 25, and 26 shall also be allowable.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

20

25

30

Appl. No. 10/710,019  
Amdt. dated August 25, 2009  
Reply to Office action of May 29, 2009

Sincerely yours,

/Winston Hsu/

Date: 08/25/2009

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : [winstonhsu@naipo.com](mailto:winstonhsu@naipo.com)

10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)